

## JOHN'S BAPTISM.

At our late conference, under the head of queries, came the subject of "John's baptism" as to whether it was christian baptism or not. We were somewhat divided as to sentiment on this question, and there was not sufficient time to fully discuss the subject; and as the side upon which I was seemed to be in the minority, I promised to give my views more fully through the EVANGELIST.

I hold that John's baptism and that taught by Christ in the great commission, are NOT the same. My first reason for this is, that all through the scriptures the former is called by Christ and the Apostles, John's baptism. My second reason is, that John's baptism was not regarded as valid, after the commission was given by Christ. Hence the only instance upon record where the disciples of John practiced his baptism after the commission was given, is found in the 19th. of Acts. By reading the 18th. of Acts you will find that Apollos, an eloquent man, being powerful in the scriptures, came to Ephesus. He knew nothing of the baptism of the commission, but only the baptism of John; but Aquila and Priscilla taught him the way of the Lord more perfectly and sent him to Corinth.

Paul soon came to Ephesus where Apollos had been preaching, and he found there certain disciples, about twelve in number. He asked them if they had received the Holy Spirit since they believed? They said: "We have not heard whether there be any Holy Spirit" Then Paul said, "Into what then were you baptized?" He saw they had not been baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, or they would have heard of the Holy Spirit. Hence he asked them into what then were you baptized.

They answered, "Into John's baptism." So after Paul explained to them the difference between that and christian baptism, "They were re-baptized into the name (eis to onoma) of the Lord Jesus." Notice, they did not say that John baptized them, but only into John's baptism which undoubtedly was administered by Apollos, who

at that time knew no baptism but John's. Aquila and Priscilla taught him christian baptism soon after.

All who had been baptized by John's baptism or by John, before trine immersion—that of the commission was instituted, were accepted so far as we know without re-baptism. But after the commission was given, and christian baptism by trine immersion or John's baptism, was not regarded as valid baptism by the apostles nor their successors, down to the present time.

Rev. James Chrystal, in his "History of the Modes of Baptism." After having introduced Tertullian's testimony, makes the following pertinent observation: "The above shows that Tertullian believed that all the baptisms of the New Testament performed AFTER the words of the commission were uttered, were performed by trine immersion." This is a tacit admission that prior to that time, the baptisms of the New Testament were single immersion.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter said to the inquiring Jews, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name (epi to onomati) upon the authority of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins etc.," This authority is found alone in the commission, which requires baptism into the name of the Father, and into the name of the Son, and into the name Holy Spirit. And any person who is baptized into but one of these names or by single immersion, as doubtless those twelve at Ephesus were, should be re-baptized by trine immersion as they were, and as the church has practiced from that time to the present.

All denominations that practice single immersion, immerse only into but one name—that of the Holy Spirit. They take the candidate into the water, and say I baptize you into the name of the Father, (and do nothing) and of the Son, (and do nothing) and of the Holy Spirit, (and baptize him into that name) hence they baptize by single dip into the name of the Holy Spirit alone, hence their converts, like those Apollos baptized at Ephesus, must be re-baptized by trine immersion before they can have christian baptism as taught by Christ in the great commission.

Apollos did not baptize into the name

of the Holy Spirit, for his converts had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit. He did not baptize into the name of the Son, for when they were re-baptized by trine immersion, they were baptized into that name, all who receive christian baptism are. There is nothing that can make single immersion christian baptism, but the command or recognition of Jesus Christ. He doubtless sanctioned it up to the time when he changed it to trine as taught in the commission, hence the apostles were not re-baptized.

I believe that John's baptism and that of Christ and the apostles, up to the time when the commission was given, was SINGLE immersion. Christ certainly did not baptize in his own name; and John did not baptize in name the of the Son, nor the Holy Spirit. They all immersed once, because they could not baptize at all unless they did. This is admitted and needs no proof. Those who contend that they dipped more than once must furnish proof for their position. This has never been done and never can be done.

If John's baptism was trine immersion, why were those at Ephesus re-baptized? and why do we not re-baptize those coming to us from other denominations who have been baptized by trine immersion? You say those at Ephesus were re-baptized, because the administrator was not properly authorized to perform the right. Is that so? How about the baptism of Alexander Mack? He was baptized by an unbaptized administrator, you had better tread cautiously along that line.

But says another, those at Ephesus were re-baptized because they had not been properly instructed in the christian faith and doctrine prior to their baptism. I ask how that could affect the validity of their baptism? Does not the same reason hold good against our receiving those who come to us from other denominations? They have received little or no instruction in the christian faith and doctrine as we understand it; and worse yet they are sometimes filled with heresy from bad teaching. Such for instance as, infant sprinkling, that the bread and wine constitute the Lord's supper, that baptism is not for the remission of sins,